

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 49

Proposition 49 is a bad approach to a good cause.

Prop 49 looks good, but in reality it disregards principles of good government by reducing government's flexibility to respond to changing needs and priorities. It takes a specific after school program, which many people will see as worthwhile, and sets it apart from all other needs funded by your tax dollars.

Read carefully. Look beyond rhetoric. See the larger picture.

This program will:

- be entitled to guaranteed funding every year, in good budget times *and bad*.
- get a free pass through the budget process *every year*.
- receive *special protection* not afforded to other priorities like public safety, health care, environmental protection, transportation, social service programs, tax cuts and even other after school programs.

And because this program receives special protection from budget cuts, it means that in times of economic downturn *other programs* may be cut to fund it—even those with potentially greater impact on children.

INADEQUATE PROVISIONS FOR RISING COSTS AND AN ONGOING BUDGET CRISIS. The drafters of this initiative say that other programs won't be cut to pay for it, because they have included a provision that would only expand after school spending when spending on other programs has also significantly expanded. Their assumption is that if there is money to expand programs like health care or public safety, there should be money to expand after school programs too.

The problem is that their trigger is too small. Inflation and population growth alone will require twice the amount they've

calculated. In tough budget times like these, that will mean other programs *will* have to be cut, or taxes raised.

A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT. Proposition 98, passed by voters in 1988, sets aside a portion of the state budget for K–14 education programs. But the amount spent on *specific* programs is still decided during the budget process, every year. No program, regardless of how worthy, gets a free ride—yet.

Prop 49 is the first attempt to earmark money for one particular program within the Proposition 98 guarantee.

Prop 49 would increase the Proposition 98 guarantee level without raising additional revenues, so that programs funded outside the guarantee would be more vulnerable during economic downturns.

If Prop 49 passes, other special interests will try similar measures in future elections. The result?

- Less flexibility to address future and changing education needs.
- Less money available in the non-Prop 98 part of the budget for other programs that directly impact the lives of our children, such as certain childcare programs, environmental programs, health care and social services.
- Less discretionary money available for local school districts.

Look at the bigger picture. VOTE NO ON PROP 49.

BARBARA INATSUGU, *President*
League of Women Voters of California

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 49

The League of Women Voters is nearly alone in their opposition to Proposition 49. And even they say 49 is “a good cause.” Here's why:

Studies by major universities prove that AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS REDUCE GANG ACTIVITY, REDUCE ALCOHOL AND DRUG USE, IMPROVE GRADES AND TEST SCORES AND MAKE OUR COMMUNITIES SAFER FOR EVERYONE.

AND PROPOSITION 49 WILL SAVE TAXPAYERS MONEY. FOR EVERY \$1 INVESTED, TAXPAYERS SAVE \$3 BY REDUCING THE COSTS OF JUVENILE CRIME, REMEDIAL EDUCATION AND GRADE REPETITION.

The League's counter arguments are primarily technical budgeting arguments and, according to state budget experts and taxpayer organizations, they are simply mistaken.

SECTION 10D OF PROPOSITION 49 SPECIFICALLY STATES THAT AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS ARE NOT GUARANTEED ANNUAL FUNDING. Funds can be cut in bad budget years in exactly the same way other education programs are cut.

PROPOSITION 49 WILL BE FUNDED ONLY AFTER OUR ECONOMY RECOVERS. STATE REVENUES FOR NON-EDUCATION PROGRAMS MUST GROW BY AT LEAST \$1.5 BILLION BEFORE PROPOSITION 49 GETS

A DIME. Budget experts and taxpayer organizations agree that \$1.5 billion is enough to protect vital programs such as HEALTH CARE, PUBLIC SAFETY and EDUCATION—WITHOUT RAISING TAXES.

Proposition 49 allows intergenerational mentoring through use of seniors and saves money by using existing school facilities.

PROPOSITION 49 HAS BEEN ENDORSED BY MAJOR STATEWIDE ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTING: DOCTORS, SENIOR CITIZENS, TAXPAYER ADVOCATES, EDUCATORS, DISTRICT ATTORNEYS, FIREFIGHTERS, LABOR UNIONS, SHERIFFS, POLICE OFFICERS, CRIME VICTIMS, CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE and by PROMINENT REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC ELECTED OFFICIALS, ACADEMIC and COMMUNITY LEADERS.

JON COUPAL, *President*
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association
JAN HARP DOMENE, *President*
California State Parent Teachers Association
TOM PORTER, *California State Director*
AARP